



Offshore Development Working Group

Meeting Minutes

Date: 10/11/2011

Start Time: 10:00am

End Time: 10:40am

Meeting Method: Go-To Meeting

Attendance: Phil Fernandez (chair), Brenda Asuncion, Neil Sims, Peggy Bond, Melanie Bondera, Thorne Abbott, Robin Kaye, Suzanne Shriner, Rodney Funakoshi, Eric Kingma, Jean Souza, Justin Viezbicke, Malia Chow, Joseph Paulin, Sarah Courbis, Elia Herman.

Agenda

1. Attendance
2. Process Discussion on How to resolve difference in opinions
3. Documents Discussion including DRAFT 2 vs. DRAFT 3
4. Precautionary principle verbiage
5. Public Comment
6. Next Meeting

September 27 was the issuance of Draft 2, led to a lot of discussion regarding the wording of precautionary principle, use of “avoidance” as part of precautionary principle. Suggested wording from various people has led to October 5th production of Draft 3.

Remember the basics: WG is advisory to the advisory council which advises the superintendent. “Advisory” is not decision-making. The document that is being worked on will not necessarily move forward as it exists; it may be modified, but it’s likely that most of the document will be accepted as it is.

There are some people who think that the document is completely done, some people think Draft 3 is still very far from being ready, some people are in the middle and think that things are very close and nearly good enough.

- Recent late-comers to the conversation may have brought the process off track, changes should be accepted.
- Should try to get this right. Want clarification about which precautionary version will move forward. Would support the Rio Summit version; San Francisco City Council one is less recognized.
- Hard to keep track of language that has been exchanged over last couple of weeks, would like to settle down to grasp specifics. Seems like a lot of the changes from Draft 2 came from the industry side.
- Main difference (between Rio and San Francisco declarations) seems to be a shift in where the burden of proof lies.



Offshore Development Working Group

Meeting Minutes

- Although this difference seems subtle, it may be very important to some people. Would like Rio definition to be simplified (e.g., it's confusing, it has a lot of double negatives); intent is not to change it, but rather, simplify it, but in the process it may have actually been unintentionally changed.
- The version with the situation where the burden "falls on those taking the action" is most clear and seemingly appropriate
 - Maybe use the definition that was in Draft 2, then include objecting paragraph to reflect strong feeling which differ
 - Would rather not have objection as a "footnote", the controversy should be in the body to explain the process so that the full advisory council can understand the struggle
- Would a third-party review of the two versions be helpful to understand how the differences are interpreted by them?
 - Perhaps not because the group is dealing with differences of opinion, not differences of understanding
 - Must go with best available scientific information, and this isn't currently reflected
- We all agree that there must be an abundance of caution. Perhaps it's appropriate to include that when considering the concept of precautionary principle, explain that this is where the group diverged (e.g., because there are different levels of trust in science and the process for permits and reviews).
- Advocate for subsequent paragraph (not footnote) after the initial paragraph hat everyone agrees
- Go back to Draft 2 with additional paragraph(s) describing the process of how we got to the final place, and the different opinions. Chair will put something together = Draft 4

Public Comment

Would like to provide input on the next call because not currently familiar with the draft that is being discussed.

- Public comment is always welcome, can email Joseph or Justin and they can forward it to all members of the working group.

Next meeting: 10/25/2011 at 10:00am